

REMARKS

Claims 17-37 are presently pending in this application. Claims 17 and 37 have been amended in this response.

In the November 3, 2006 Office Action, all of the pending claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 6,208,156 to Hembree ("Hembree").

The undersigned attorney wishes to thank the Examiner for engaging in a telephone conference on January 30, 2007, and requests that this paper constitute the applicant's Interview Summary. During the telephone conference, the present Office Action, Hembree, claims 24, 26 and 32, and a proposed claim amendment to claims 17 and 37 were discussed. The examiner agreed as follows:

(1) The amendment adding "wherein at least a section of the support surface positioned to contact at least one of the interconnect elements is dielectric" to claims 17 and 37 patentably distinguishes over the applied art;

(2) The Section 102(b) rejection of claim 24 will be withdrawn because the claimed combination of features including, *inter alia*, apertures having "a first beveled portion proximate to the support surface and a second beveled portion proximate to the exterior surface" distinguishes over the applied art;

(3) The Section 102(b) rejection of claim 26 will be withdrawn because the claimed combination of features including, *inter alia*, a support surface wherein "at least a section of the support surface positioned to contact at least one of the interconnect elements is dielectric" distinguishes over the applied art; and

(4) The Section 102(b) rejection of claim 32 will be withdrawn because the claimed combination of features including, *inter alia*, a body having a shelf and a ball support member carried by the shelf distinguishes over the applied art.

A. Response to the Section 102(b) Rejection

Claims 17-37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Hembree. In light of the agreement reached during the January 30, 2007, telephone conference, the Section 102(b) rejection of claims 17, 24, 26, 32 and 37 should be withdrawn.


Claims 18-23 and 25 depend from claim 17; claims 27-31 depend from claim 26; and claims 33-36 depend from claim 32. Accordingly, the Section 102(b) rejection of these claims should be withdrawn for the reasons discussed above with reference to their respective independent claims and for the additional features of these dependent claims.

B. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, the pending claims comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112 and patentably define over the applied art. The Applicant accordingly requests reconsideration of the application and a Notice of Allowance. If the Examiner has any questions or believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact Aaron J. Poledna at (206) 359-3982.

Respectfully submitted,
Perkins Coie LLP

Date: 2/5/07



Aaron J. Poledna
Registration No. 54,675

Correspondence Address:

Customer No. 25096
Perkins Coie LLP
P.O. Box 1247
Seattle, Washington 98111-1247
(206) 359-8000